

plague is rife in the Jullundur and Ludhiana districts; in the latter area 21 cases and 11 deaths occurred between May 12th and 19th, and in one village of 660 persons in the Umballa district 40 cases of plague with 35 deaths had occurred up to May 22nd. In the whole country, in fact, round the foot of the Simla hills plague is raging, and with Kumaon and Ghurwal, where plague has been endemic for many years; in the immediate neighbourhood there seems every prospect of a continuance of plague in the Punjab and the north-west of India generally.

MAURITIUS.

During the week ending June 13th 2 fatal cases occurred from plague in Mauritius.

HONG KONG.

The epidemic of plague continues, and the virulence of the pest is manifested by the high percentage of fatal cases to those attacked. Few Chinese survive an attack, and several Europeans have succumbed to the disease. Two of the European staff of A. S. Watson and Co.'s dispensary died of plague during the present outbreak. During the week ending June 15th there were 151 cases and 151 deaths.

POOR-LAW MEDICAL OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION.

THE annual general meeting of this Association took place on Tuesday at the Trocadero, Piccadilly Circus, at 6 P.M., and at 7 P.M. the members and their friends, under the presidency of Dr. FARQUHARSON, M.P., dined together. Sir Walter Foster, M.P., Dr. Heron, and Dr. Dawson Williams were the guests of the Association, and among the members present were Mr. Balding, F.R.C.S., J.P., of Royston, President of the Council, Dr. Holder (Hull), Dr. Matthews (Manchester), Dr. Jones (Enfield), Dr. Primrose Wells (Beckenham), Dr. Gayton, Treasurer; Drs. Oliver, Walter Smith, Lloyd Jones, Galloway, Ryan, and Hill (London), and the Hon. Secretary, Dr. Major Greenwood; Mr. F. Greenwood was also present, representing Messrs. Beckingsale and Co., the solicitors to the Association.

Mr. BALDING proposed the health of "The Guests," and in the course of his remarks pointed out some of the grievances that Poor-law medical officers laboured under, and how terribly some of them struck at the welfare of the suffering poor. Some of the Poor-law Orders, he said, were lamentably out of date, being more than half a century old, and quite out of unison with the requirements of the present day. He drew special attention to the absence of any machinery for providing anaesthetics in the case of operations performed on pauper patients outside the infirmaries, pointing out that when they were administered all the cost and anxiety of providing them fell upon an underpaid medical official.

Dr. HERON, in responding, spoke strongly of the want of union that existed in the profession, and maintained that it was largely due to this that many of the evils complained of by the last speaker had existed so many years. He compared the comparative influence in public matters possessed by the legal profession with the impotence of the medical profession. While Parliament was full of lawyers, and the House of Lords had many representatives there, the medical M.P.'s might be counted upon one's fingers, and in the Upper House there was but one representative. It was impossible to imagine the occurrence of such an insult to the legal profession, as had only recently been offered in Parliament to the medical profession, and the remarks made by responsible members of the Government had been little short of a scandal.

Sir WALTER FOSTER, in proposing the toast of "The Poor-law Medical Officers' Association," in a vigorous and practical speech, further enlarged on the want of union existing in the profession on all political matters. Nine-tenths of the profession, he said, blindly voted for a party without troubling in the least how, as a profession, they were treated by the Governments whom they largely helped to elect. He thought they were not doing wisely in this respect. Many of the matters that were of importance for their own interests were also highly salutary for the public at large, and it was therefore incumbent on medical men to unite and insist on necessary reforms. If they could not be got from one party, then let the profession vote for the other, whichever it might be, which would further such reforms. That was really the true principle of party politics, and until the profession generally realised it, medical men would continue to occupy their present insignificant and impotent position.

The HONORARY SECRETARY, in responding, regretted that there were not more members present to hear both Sir Walter Foster's and Dr. Heron's remarks. He thoroughly agreed with much that had been said, and he showed what the

Poor-law Medical Officers' Association had endeavoured to do to promote Poor-law reform during the last half-century; especially pointing out how greatly the public were indebted to the labours of Dr. Joseph Rogers, their first President, whose name, he said, was synonymous with Poor-law reform.

Dr. HOLDER proposed "The Health of the President," which was suitably acknowledged by Dr. FARQUHARSON, who expressed his concurrence with the view that the medical profession should take means to bring its views and its needs more prominently and more frequently before the House of Commons.

Dr. WALTER SMITH proposed the health of the President of Council, Dr. Balding.

The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the Honorary Secretary.

THE CRUELTY OF ANTIVIVISECTIONISM.

WE have received the following letter from the Hon. Stephen Coleridge, Honorary Secretary of the National Antivivisection Society:

92, Victoria Street, London, S.W.,

June 17th, 1901.

SIR,—Your attempts to deal with my summary I will dispose of, with your kind permission, *seriatim*:

1. You stated that the schools I had referred to were "integral parts of the hospitals." I quote the words of the Chairman of one of the hospitals that flatly contradict your statement. *Ergo*, your statement, which included all those I had referred to, is inaccurate.

As to Guy's, what may have happened in 1825 can hardly concern subscribers to-day, and my contention is that, if the school be at present an integral part of the hospital, its accounts should be published with those of the hospital, and they are not. As to the Middlesex, my contention is the same. At Charing Cross they do publish some slight summary of the school's accounts, and therefore this is the only school among those I have referred to which is treated in the matter of its accounts as though it were an integral part of the hospital. Therefore, the first of my main contentions remains unshaken. And let me here point out how you think fit to conduct this controversy with me.

On May 25th I quoted the statement in the accounts of the Middlesex Hospital, signed by chartered accountants, that £800 was given out of the hospital's funds to the Medical School as "a contribution towards lecturers' emoluments." You replied on June 1st that this was "a piece of accountants' legerdemain." I rejoin in your issue of June 8th that I must leave the auditors to deal with your assertion that they have been guilty of legerdemain. And in your issue of the 15th you say, "Nor is it our business to defend any accountants' legerdemain that Mr. Coleridge may fancy he detects in their audited accounts."

It is you, and not I, that have accused the accountants of legerdemain; as you know or ought to know. Nor will this attempt to put upon me the authorship of your own ineptitude save you from condemnation for culpable carelessness or conscious misrepresentation.

You say I have never traversed your contention that the hospitals get more than an equivalent for the money they give to the schools. I have been traversing it for more than a year. I have said, and say again, that no such equivalent is to be found in the published accounts of the hospitals; that medical students, instead of having their education paid for in part out of hospital funds, should pay for their own education like other students; and that if the governors of a hospital have a legal right to make these grants of hospital funds to medical schools licensed for vivisection (a matter that as far as I know has never been before a court of law) we antivivisectionists have an equal right, which we shall strenuously exercise, of informing the charitable who give the money to the hospitals, of the strange channels into which their benefactions are conveyed.

2. Avoiding the studious insult of its conveyance, I accept this paragraph as a challenge to me to substantiate the innuendo "that the subsidising of medical schools means the torture of animals." I accept that challenge, and my answer is that where subsidies are paid to a medical school,